DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 962 CS 502 663

AUTHOR Cambra, Ronald E.; Klopf, Donald W.
TITLE Communication Apprehension among Hawaiians.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Communication Association of the Pacific (Honolulu, HI, July 30-August 1, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anxiety; Business Skills; College Students; Educational Research; Fear; Higher Education; *Speech Communication; *Writing
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Apprehension; *Communication Research; Hawaii

ABSTRACT

Communication apprehension among Hawaiians is the subject of three related papers in this document. Each of the papers defines communication apprehension and discusses the implications of such anxiety on a person's functioning in society. The first paper describes a study in which 16% of a sample of University of Hawaii students, also employed, scored in the high or severe apprehensive category on the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension. A program for lowering apprehension is also described. The second paper describes a study of undergraduates at the University of Hawaii that concluded that the university had a greater incidence of apprehension than elsewhere in the nation. The third paper explores the relationship between apprehension about speaking and about writing among University of Hawaii students and concludes that Hawaiian students perceived themselves to be more apprehensive about writing than did the general American population and that an inverse relationship existed between apprehension of oral communication and writing. (MKM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178962

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AMONG HAWAIIANS

Ronald E. Cambra and Donald W. Klopf
University of Hawaii

(1) Communication Apprehension in Hawaii's Businesses

(2) A Further Study of Communication Apprehension among University of Hawaii Students

(3) The Relationship Between Apprehension About Speaking and About Writing

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ronald E. Cambra
Donald W. Klopf
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS502663

COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION IN HAWAII'S BUSINESSES

Ronald E. Cambra and Donald W. Klopf*
University of Hawaii

For the typical business, governmental, industrial or professional organization to function at all, much less to function efficiently, the members of that organization must communicate frequently with each other and with people outside the organization. Much of the communication is written but the preponderant amount of communication within most organizations is oral (20). Every work day millions of oral interactions take place for purposes of giving and receiving instructions, selling ideas or products, appraising performance, handling grievances, and solving problems. For instance, a vast number of oral transactions occur daily between doctors and patients, employers and employees, lawyers and clients, salesclerks and customers, teachers and students, social workers and those in need of professional help, to mention a few occupations (8).

In Hawaii 43.1% of the average working person's day is spent speaking or listening, although the time varies from occupation to occupation. Local professional people spend the most time (67% of the work day) speaking and listening followed in order by sales people (54.1%), administrators (48.4%), engineers (47.4%), clerical (45.3%), technical (39.5%), skilled (21%) and unskilled workers (19.1%). Locally, those people in the occupations that include the highest paid, best educated, and most highly trained people do the greatest amount of oral communication (8).

Recognizing the central role oral communication plays in organizational effectiveness, many organizations throughout the nation spend large sums of money to enhance the communication skills of employees, particularly those persons in middle and upper management levels. Much of that money is being wasted, however, because the communication problem for many of the people undergoing the skills training is not one of the skills deficiencies, but one of orientation toward communication. The orientation problem is apprehension about speaking, a problem not dealt with in the normal training program (20).

---

*Cambra is Assistant Professor and Klopf, Professor, Department of Speech, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. The writers express their appreciation to Charlene Goodness, Cromwell Crawford, Edward Currie, Samuel Lee, K. K. Seo, Rex Wade, Jeanne Oka and Joyce Webb for their assistance.
Prepared for the Communication Association of the Pacific Convention, July 30, 1979, Honolulu.

Among employed persons sampled in Hawaii, approximately 16 percent were highly apprehensive about communicating orally in the organizational setting. This percentage corresponds to the level of work-related oral apprehension found elsewhere in the nation (20). However, the Hawaii sample represents an extraordinary group of people and, with a more normal sample, there is reason to believe the level would be higher than the 16 percent reported. The purpose here is to explain how the percent was obtained, why it may be higher and what can be done about reducing it. Before doing so, it is necessary to describe communication apprehension and its impact on people's lives.

Communication Apprehension

Apprehension about orally communicating is a person's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated talk with one or more persons. A person who experiences a high level is one whose fear or anxiety outweighs any expected gains from talking with others and thus is more likely to avoid communicating whenever possible. Such a person not only suffers from the common "stage fright" the normal person feels when giving a speech to an audience, the apprehensive person is almost always fearful or anxious in all speaking situations including the public speaking situation. When forced to speak, the apprehensive one appears to be shy, non-assertive, embarrassed, uncomfortable, and reticent (2).

The Impact of Apprehension

At Work.

In the work situation, the highly apprehensive employee reports fear and anxiety about work-related speaking such as representing the organization to other people, fielding questions at a company meeting, talking to subordinates and/or superiors, and interviewing people. The apprehensive is afraid to speak up in a conversation and dislikes company meetings. With customers, he or she may have difficulty thinking about the right things to say or may not know what to say. As a consequence, others tend to perceive the highly apprehensive person in a negative light (10, 15) and this perception affects the person's life in many ways (13).

In the work environment, the highly apprehensive person is not only viewed negatively by customers, co-workers and supervisors (20), other affects point to a potentially major impact on the organization. Such a person prefers occupations with low communication requirements while the person with a low apprehensive level

seeks jobs with high speaking requirements (4). The highly apprehensive is less likely to desire advancement since moving up in the corporate hierarchy usually results in increased speaking. On the other hand, the highly apprehensive, because of reluctance to speak up on many occasions, would not be as readily promoted as a less reluctant employee (19, 3). The highly apprehensive job applicant is less likely to be granted a job interview, and, if interviewed, would more apt to be negatively evaluated, often being considered a person who would not get along well with co-workers and one who would need much additional training (3). At work, the highly apprehensive turns out to be less satisfied with the job than the person with a low level of apprehension (5).

In Social Situations.

Socially, the highly apprehensive person is seen as less attractive, less sociable, less competent, less sexually alluring and less composed than other persons (11), perhaps making the apprehensive worker a liability when representing the company in social situations.

In School.

As could be expected, the highly apprehensive is negatively impacted in other facets of life besides on the job and in social situations. Academically, the apprehensive typically has a lower overall college grade-point average, lower grades in small classes and lower achievement scores on standardized tests than the less apprehensive in spite of what could be a normal or high intelligence level. Also, the apprehensive develops a dislike for school early and drops out readily (7).

Part of the negative academic impact stems from teacher and fellow student expectations. Teachers expect the highly apprehensive to have a lower academic achievement, less satisfactory relationships with peers, and a lower probability of academic success than less apprehensive students. In the classroom, the apprehensive's peers tend to ignore him or her having learned to do so from trying to involve the apprehensive in class discussions (7).

Causes of Apprehension

What causes communication apprehension? While all of the causes are not fully known, communication apprehension probably cannot be attributed to heredity. Highly apprehensive parents do not necessarily produce highly apprehensive children. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that communication apprehension is learned by the individual, usually during the early childhood years. When the

child is positively reinforced for speaking, it appears unlikely that the child will become highly apprehensive. With positive reinforcement, the child learns to value speech both as a tool and as an intrinsically desirable experience.

The child who is not reinforced for speaking, or is punished, fails to develop the normal appreciation for oral communication. The child does not find intrinsic reward in communication itself, nor learns the instrumental functions of communication. For such a child, communication is not a tool. Rather, for that child, communicating becomes a negative experience. Such a child is very likely to develop a high level of communication apprehension (16).

Impact of Reinforcement.

Reinforcement works in different ways in various circumstances. For instance, only and first-born children tend to receive much more parental attention than do later-born children and the result is that later-born children engage in less verbal activity than the other children because the later-born receive less reinforcement for talking.

Some families place little stress on verbal behavior, believing children are to be "seen and not heard," as in the highly authoritarian home. In those homes, the children are reinforced for being quiet, not for talking.

While North Americans value talk highly and verbally active people are positively perceived, other cultures value speech differently and the normal verbal activity of Americans is viewed as excessive. Children in those cultures will not receive the reinforcement for speaking that most American children get. Instead, quietness will be reinforced and apprehension about speaking could develop.

Speaking-skill deficiencies frequently constitute another cause for apprehension. Not all children develop facility for language and speech at the same rate. Some develop early and may be rewarded for the early development. Others develop late, causing concern among parents, relatives, and friends, who may perceive them as slow learners, backward, or not so bright. Also, a small number of children develop abnormally and require clinical assistance. For the slow and abnormally developing children, speaking often becomes an anxiety-producing situation and they can obtain more positive results by not speaking (14).

Developing Apprehension.

Usually high communication apprehension develops in preschool years or does not develop at all. However, there are instances where it develops later, or

develops early but is eliminated during early school years. Each of these effects can be attributed to the impact of the school environment--teachers and peers. For the child who has experienced negative reinforcement in the pre-school years and enters school as a high communication apprehensive, extensive positive reinforcement from teachers and later from peers can help overcome the problem. However, such positive reinforcement is not always provided. Similarly, a child may enter school as a moderate communication apprehensive but negative reinforcement from teachers and peers may cause the level of communication apprehension to increase. Neither of these effects will occur quickly, and the change in the child may be hardly noticeable, even to a trained observer. Patterns which are developed over several years prior to entering school are seldom reversed in a single year (16).

Some children are trained to be silent and in later life society often reinforces that training as this quotation stresses:

> Parents, teachers, clergymen, and businessmen have unwittingly conspired to produce a nation of timid souls. In early years, many mothers and fathers censor the child who decides to speak up for his rights and thus, hinder the child's assertion of self. Teachers reward the student who does not question the educational system and deal sternly with those who buck it. In most cases the church fosters the idea of humility and sacrifice rather than standing up for self. Many an employee learns early in his career that if he 'speaks up,' he is not likely to receive a raise or promotion and may even lose his job. Adopted at the office, this attitude carries over to home and social life (6).

Hawaii's School Problem

Approximately 20 percent of the students in American universities have a high degree of apprehension about communicating orally. In public schools, from kindergarten through the twelfth grade, a similar percentage of students are affected (13). Researchers consider speaking apprehension a learning disability and believe it affects more elementary and secondary students than do such mental and physical handicaps as mental retardation, emotional disturbances, deafness, blindness, and being crippled (16).

In comparison to the rest of the nation, Hawaii's incidence is greater. At the University of Hawaii, 48 percent of the students sampled perceived themselves as being apprehensive about communicating. Of this group, 32 percent fall into the highly or severely apprehensive categories (17). In Hawaii's high schools, a sampling of several hundred students from a dozen schools reveals a slightly higher incidence than among the university students (1).

Work-Related Apprehension in Hawaii

Sixteen percent of the employees sampled in Hawaii, as noted earlier, were highly apprehensive about communicating orally in the work setting.

Method.

To secure this percentage, 206 individuals employed during October 1978 completed the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension--Organization Form (20). Representing 22 employing organizations, the sample was heterogenous with respect to occupation, position in the organizational hierarchy, and degree of responsibility. Half of the employees worked at jobs which research claims (8) involve the least amount of time speaking with others (e.g., clerical, technical, skilled and unskilled jobs). The other half worked in occupations which require more time speaking (e.g., teachers, administrators, engineers, salespeople and business managers). The sample's age range was 18 to 53 years with a mean of 25 years. Males constituted 65 percent of the sample and females, 35 percent. All were taking University of Hawaii courses, enrolled as part-time students and employed on a full-time basis.

The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension is a self-report measure of occupational apprehension. It consists of twenty items related to speaking on the job such as "talking to my supervisor makes me nervous," "I look forward to interviewing people applying for a job," and "I am afraid to express myself in a group." The responses are given on a Likert-type, five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This measure correlates highly with similar instruments and its reliability and validity seems well-established. A person scoring 62 or higher, based on the norms for this measure, is highly apprehensive. A score of 72 or over indicates severe apprehension and implies someone who may not survive the communication demands of the typical organization without negative consequences (20). Case studies (18) and broader surveys of reticents (21) support this implication.

Hawaii Compared to the Nation.

Sixteen percent of the Hawaii sample scored 62 or above, 13 percent in the high apprehensive category and 3 percent in the severe group. The Hawaii sample was compared statistically with the persons who constitute the normative group for the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (20). No significant difference resulted from the comparison, suggesting that the Hawaii group was much like other employed people in the nation.

However, there appears to be a difference between the Hawaiians and the

normative group which quite likely influences the results. The Hawaiians were enrolled in college classes when they completed the Personal Report; this was not the case for the other group. Research indicates that apprehensives tend to be reluctant about engaging in oral activities and typically avoid them whenever they can (12). The classroom often is considered such an activity. Thus, the Hawaiians, with everyone going to school, may not be representative of the normal population. For that reason, more research seems in order involving a more typical mixture of employees. Possibly such research would bring a greater percentage of apprehensives and resemble more closely the incidence in the local schools.

High and Low Communicators.

Since half of the Hawaiians studied engaged in occupations involving much talking and half involving little, the Personal Report scores of the two groups were compared. The results of the comparison showed that the two groups were significantly different, supporting previous research findings that high apprehensives prefer jobs requiring less communication while those persons with little or no apprehension prefer jobs requiring more communication (4).

Reducing Apprehension

In most human endeavor in America, effective communication is essential to success. Positive interpersonal relationships are created as a result of people talking with each other. In the classroom, students need to interact with fellow students and the teachers in order to get the most from the learning experience. Most occupations today require that a person speak effectively (14). As noted previously, many businesses and industries are aware of the importance of good speech and spend millions to improve their employees speaking abilities.

Communication scholars, recognizing the negative consequences of high communication apprehension for the person experiencing it, have experimented with ways of reducing the anxiety. Most of the ways have yet to receive sufficient empirical validation for their use with the general public. But each has merits and is useful in certain circumstances. Among these are hypnosis, relaxation induced by biofeedback, group counseling, reality therapy, assertion training, false heartrate feedback and conditioned relaxation (2).

Because of the high incidence among University of Hawaii students, a concentrated effort is being made by the Department of Speech to reduce their apprehension level and thus to increase their speech effectiveness and employability. The

effort takes two forms: the introductory speech course, Speech 151, Personal and Public Speech, and a voluntary desensitization laboratory.

Personal and Public Speech.

Although reducing apprehension constitutes only one of the goals in Speech 151, it is an important goal and the course is structured in such a fashion as to promote anxiety reduction.

The underlying philosophy of the course is that the student needs to have an understanding of what can be accomplished by the use of the various speech forms in particular communication situations. Knowing how to identify each situation and the people in it, the student should know what is permissible, what should not be done, and what kinds of discourse would be most useful. Then, the student needs to know the skills necessary to meet the goals established for each situation. The course concerns rhetorical oral communication, that is, speech directed to some purpose, as opposed to expressive.

In the course, the student orally interacts first in simple dyadic, or face-to-face encounters with another student, then progresses to small group interaction. Several public speaking assignments complete the semester-long course. Although other reasons exist for creating this progression from the one-to-one to the public speaking situation, one reason is that the progression moves the student from the more comfortable, informal conversation-like situation to the more stressful, formal public address situation. Thus, the student tackles the less anxiety-producing situations first and the most stressful last, after gaining confidence along the way.

The results have been repeatedly verified (7); the class does reduce communication apprehension rather than increase it.

Desensitization Laboratory.

In another attempt to lower the apprehension level, a two-part systematic desensitization program was instituted for the highly apprehensive students. The first part, self-instructional in nature, helps the students cope with speech anxiety through relaxation and desensitization exercises. Designed to let students vizualize themselves in speaking situations, the exercises utilize muscle relaxation to control and overcome anxiety responses to the situations.

The second part of the lab's program provides training in the speaking skills that help develop more positive relations with others. The inability to relate positively is a common failing among the highly apprehensive. People should be

able to insist on their rights in interpersonal transactions without feeling guilty, anxious, or fearful as long as they don't infringe on the rights of others. They should be able to stand up for themselves without undue anxiety, to express their honest feelings comfortably, and to exercise their rights without denying the rights of others. Such qualities are not characteristic of apprehensive people. They bottle up emotions, are uncomfortable in social situations, are unable to voice opinions, feelings and thoughts, are passive, can't say "no" to unreasonable requests, can't accept compliments, have a poor self-concept, and are inhibited and anxious (7).

The speaking skills covered in the lab are elementary, actually ones people would have learned if the elementary school they attended had speech training. The skills are how to ask questions, talk about oneself, join a conversation, tell stories, end conversations, give and receive compliments, express feelings, reduce guilt and apologize. Surprisingly, apprehensive people experience difficulty performing those rudimentary functions (9).

The results of the lab training show that the lab not only reduces the apprehension level of those enrolled but it also helps them learn how to handle simple conversational situations (7).

Conclusion

Apprehension about communicating constitutes a problem in Hawaii's businesses, governmental, industrial and professional organizations. Sixteen percent of the employees in those organizations are highly apprehensive in the work environment and consequently both the employees and their organizations are negatively impacted. Apprehensive employees tend to represent their organizations poorly in speaking situations, making them a liability to these organizations.

Hawaii's problem probably is more acute than elsewhere in the nation. The abnormally high incidence of apprehension in the public schools and at the University of Hawaii most likely means Hawaii's organizations will employ many more apprehensive people than Mainland companies, especially since the local schools seem unconcerned or reluctant about enhancing students' speaking effectiveness. Although the University of Hawaii's introductory speech course has proved effective as has its desensitization laboratory, prevention undoubtedly is better than cure and steps can be taken to reduce the chances of developing high apprehension. For instance, parents can exert extra effort during a child's formative years to reinforce speaking skills; elementary school teachers also can provide

reinforcement, especially to the apprehensive child; and at the elementary and secondary school levels, training in the speaking skills appropriate to the child's development can be required.

REFERENCES

1. R. E. Cambra and D. W. Klopf, "An Exploratory Study of Contest Speaker Characteristics," Speech Education, 6, 1978, 121-131.

2. R. Cambra, D. Klopf, and B. Oka, "Communication Apprehension Among University of Hawaii Students," Hawaii Council of Teachers of English convention paper, Honolulu, 1978.

3. J. A. Daly and S. Leth, "Communication Apprehension and the Personnel Selection Decision," International Communication Association convention paper, Portland, 1976.

4. J. A. Daly and J. C. McCroskey, "Occupational Choice and Desirability as a Function of Communication Apprehension," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 309-313.

5. R. L. Falcione, J. C. McCroskey and J. Daly, "Job Satisfaction as a Function of Employees' Communication Apprehension, Self-Esteem, and Perceptions of Their Immediate Supervisors," Communication Yearbook I, B. D. Ruben, ed. (Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1977), 363-375.

6. H. Fensterheim and J. Baer, Don't Say Yes When You Want To Say No (New York: Dell Pub., Co., 1975), 20-21.

7. D. W. Klopf, "A Method of Reducing Apprehension in the Classroom," Speech Education, 6, 1978, 64-73.

8. D. W. Klopf, "Business and Professional Communication in Hawaii," Speech Education, 5, 1977.

9. D. W. Klopf, Increasing Assertion: A Method of Reducing Apprehension (San Jose, CA: Lansford Pub., Co., 1979).

10. J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, V. P. Richmond and B. G. Cox, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on Interpersonal Attraction," Human Communication Research, 2, 1975, 51-65.

11. J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, V. P. Richmond and R. L. Falcione, "Studies of the Relationship Between Communication Apprehension and Self Esteem," Human Communication Research, 3, 1977, 264-277.

12. J. C. McCroskey, "Measures of Communication-Bound Anxiety," Speech Monographs, 37, 1970, 269-277.

13. J. C. McCroskey, "Oral Communication Apprehension: A Summary of Recent Theory and Research," Human Communication Research, 4, 1977.

14. J. C. McCroskey, Quiet Children and the Classroom Teacher (Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1977).

15. J. C. McCroskey and V. P. Richmond, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on the Perception of Peers," Western Speech Communication, 40, 1976, 14-21.

16. J. C. McCroskey, "The Problem of Communication Apprehension in the Classroom," Communication, 4, 1976, 117-119.

17. B. J. Oka, R. E. Cambra and D. W. Klopf, "Reducing Apprehension about Communication," Psychological Reports, 44, 1979, 430.

18. G. Phillips and D. Butt, "Reticence Re-visited," Pennsylvania Speech Annual, 23, 1966, 40-57.

19. V. P. Richmond, "Communication Apprehension and Success in the Job Applicant Screening Process," International Communication Association convention paper, Berlin, 1977.

20. M. D. Scott, J. C. McCroskey and M. E. Sheahan, "Measuring Communication Apprehension," Journal of Communication, 28, 1978, 104-111.

21. L. R. Wheeless, "Communication Apprehension in the Elementary School," Speech Teacher, 20, 1971, 297-299.

A FURTHER STUDY OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AMONG UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII STUDENTS

by Ronald Cambra and Donald Klopf
University of Hawaii

(Prepared for the Communication Association of the Pacific Convention, July 30, 1979, Honolulu.)

Previous research revealed that University of Hawaii students probably have one of the highest incidences of communication apprehension among the nation's universities. Of 702 students sampled during the 1977-78 academic year, 32 percent perceived themselves to be apprehensive about communicating orally (2). Nationally, about 20 percent of the students in major universities have high apprehension (13).

The Hawaii population, however, consisted solely of students enrolled in the introductory speech course, Speech 151, Personal and Public Speech, on the University's Manoa campus. While this group included an equal portion of both sexes and had representatives from all colleges and classes in an age range from 18 to 25 years (2), it was limited to students from one campus in the University system and to those students taking the one course. In the Fall 1978 semester, to obtain a broader sampling, we replicated the earlier study, this time with a heterogenous population from five of the University campuses, and the results are presented here.

Apprehension about Speaking

Before doing so, we should describe communication apprehension, first by defining it, next by noting its impact on people's lives and, finally by examining its causes.

APPREHENSION DEFINED.

Apprehension about orally communicating is a person's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated talk with one or more persons. A person who experiences a high level is one whose fear or anxiety outweighs any expected gains from talking with others and thus is more likely to avoid communicating whenever possible. Such a person not only suffers from the common "stage fright" the normal person feels when giving a speech to an audience, the apprehensive person is almost always fearful or anxious in all speaking situations including the public speaking situation. When forced to speak, the apprehensive one appears to be shy, non-assertive, embarrassed, uncomfortable, and reticent (2,9).

ACADEMIC, SOCIAL, WORK IMPACT.

Academically, the apprehensive typically has a lower overall college grade-point average, lower grades in small classes and lower achievement scores on standardized tests than the less apprehensive in spite of what could be a normal or high intelligence level. Also, the apprehensive develops a dislike for school early and drops out readily (7,21). Part of

the negative academic impact stems from teacher and fellow student expectations. Teachers expect the highly apprehensive to have a lower academic achievement, less satisfactory relationships with peers, and a lower probability of academic success than less apprehensive students. In the classroom, the apprehensive's peers tend to ignore him or her having learned to do so from trying to involve the apprehensive in class discussions (16).

Socially, the highly apprehensive person is seen as less attractive, less sociable, less competent, less sexually alluring and less composed than other persons (11).

In the work situation, the highly apprehensive employee reports fear and anxiety about work-related speaking such as representing the organization to other people, fielding questions at a company meeting, talking to subordinates and/or superiors, and interviewing people. The apprehensive is afraid to speak up in a conversation and dislikes company meetings. With customers, he or she may have difficulty thinking about the right things to say or may not know what to say. As a consequence, others tend to perceive the highly apprehensive person in a negative light (6, 10, 15) and this perception affects the person's life in many ways (6, 13).

In the work environment, the highly apprehensive person is not only viewed negatively by customers, co-workers and supervisors (20), other affects point to a potentially major impact on the organization. Such a person prefers occupations with low communication requirements while the person with a low apprehensive level seeks jobs with high speaking requirements (4). The highly apprehensive is less likely to desire advancement since moving up in the corporate hierarchy usually results in increased speaking. On the other hand, the highly apprehensive, because of reluctance to speak up on many occasions, would not be as readily promoted as a less reluctant employee (19, 3). The highly apprehensive job applicant is less likely to be granted a job interview, and, if interviewed, would more apt to be negatively evaluated, often being considered a person who would not get along well with co-workers and one who would need much additional training (3). At work, the highly apprehensive turns out to be less satisfied with the job than the person with a low level of apprehension (5).

CAUSES OF APPREHENSION.

While all of the causes are not fully known, communication apprehension probably cannot be attributed to heredity. Highly apprehensive parents do not necessarily produce highly apprehensive children. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that communication apprehension is learned by the individual, usually during the early childhood years. When the child is positively reinforced for speaking, it appears unlikely that the child will become highly apprehensive. With positive reinforcement, the child learns to value speech both as a tool and as an intrinsically desirable experience.

The child who is not reinforced for speaking, or is punished, fails to develop the normal appreciation for oral communication. The child does not find intrinsic reward in communication itself, nor learns the instrumental functions of communication. For such a child, communication is not a tool. Rather, for that child, communicating becomes a negative experience. Such

a child is very likely to develop a high level of communication apprehension (16).

Reinforcement works in different ways in various circumstances. For instance, only and first-born children tend to receive much more parental attention than do later-born children and the result is that later-born children engage in less verbal activity than the other children because the later-born receive less reinforcement for talking.

Some families place little stress on verbal behavior, believing children are to be "seen and not heard," as in the highly authoritarian home. In those homes, the children are reinforced for being quiet, not for talking.

While North Americans value talk highly and verbally active people are positively perceived, other cultures value speech differently and the normal verbal activity of Americans is viewed as excessive. Children in those cultures will not receive the reinforcement for speaking that most American children get. Instead, quietness will be reinforced and apprehension about speaking could develop.

Speaking-skill deficiencies frequently constitute another cause for apprehension. Not all children develop facility for language and speech at the same rate. Some develop early and may be rewarded for the early development. Others develop late, causing concern among parents, relatives, and friends, who may perceive them as slow learners, backward, or not so bright. Also, a small number of children develop abnormally and require clinical assistance. For the slow and abnormally developing children, speaking often becomes an anxiety-producing situation and they can obtain more positive results by not speaking (14).

Usually high communication apprehension develops in preschool years or does not develop at all. However, there are instances where it develops later, or develops early but is eliminated during early school years. Each of these effects can be attributed to the impact of the school environment --teachers and peers. For the child who has experienced negative reinforcement in the pre-school years and enters school as a high communication apprehensive, extensive positive reinforcement from teachers and later from peers can help overcome the problem. However, such positive reinforcement is not always provided. Similarly, a child may enter school as a moderate communication apprehensive but negative reinforcement from teachers and peers may cause the level of communication apprehension to increase. Neither of these effects will occur quickly, and the change in the child may be hardly noticeable, even to a trained observer. Patterns which are developed over several years prior to entering school are seldom reversed in a single year (16).

Apprehension in the University System

The high incidence of perceived apprehension among University of Hawaii students reported in earlier research (2, 8) prompted us to further investigate its extent by studying varied University student populations. While the earlier research was confined to students in the introductory speech class, the research reported here includes students from five

University of Hawaii campuses taking a variety of courses.

During the Fall 1978 semester, the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension for College Students (PRCA-College, 12) was administered to these groups: (1) 756 University of Hawaii at Manoa undergraduate students from all course levels and colleges; (2) 117 University of Hawaii at Manoa postgraduate students enrolled in the School of Law; (3) 80 Hawaii Community College students; 36 Honolulu Community College students; 46 Windward Community College students and 120 Kapiolani Community College students. The community college sample represented a heterogenous grouping of undergraduate students in liberal arts and vocational-technical courses.

The PRCA-College is a self-report measure of speaking apprehension. It consists of twenty items dealing with one's perceptions about talking to others in the dyadic, small group and public speaking situations. The responses are given on a Likert-type, five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A person scoring 70 or higher, based on the norms for this measure, is considered highly apprehensive while someone scoring 80 or above is severly apprehensive (12). The measure correlates highly with similar instruments and its reliability and validity seem well-established. Our use supports this (1, 2, 7, 17).

For reporting purposes, we compared the undergraduate Manoa students to the Law School group and to those from all of the other campuses. Table 1 shows the results.

Table 1.

UH-Manoa Undergraduates Compared To Law and Community College Students

Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	d.f.	t
UH-Manoa Undergraduates compared to	756	62.35		
1. UH-Manoa Law School	117	56.62	871	4.75*
2. Community Colleges	282	63.00	1036	.77**

* $p < .01$ ** N.S.

A significant difference occurred between the Law School students and the University of Hawaii-Manoa undergraduate population, indicating that the Law School students as a group were less apprehensive than the Manoa undergraduates. But there was no significant difference between the Manoa and community college groups, suggesting a similar degree of apprehension between both groups.

Percentage-wise, 26.7 percent of the Manoa undergraduates and 29.7 percent of the community college groups fell into the highly and severe apprehensive categories, scoring 70 or above on the PRCA-College. However, only 15.3 percent of the Law School students scored above 70. The Law

School students, being post-graduates preparing for a career which heavily emphasizes oral skills, should have little apprehension about oral interaction.

Table 2 offers a comparison between the Manoa undergraduate population and each of the community college groups. As could be expected from examining Table 1, no significant difference appeared between the Manoa group and the others.

Table 2.

UH-Manoa Undergraduates Compared to Each Community College Group

Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	d.f.	t
UH-Manoa Undergraduates compared to	756	62.35		
1. Hawaii CC	80	64.60	834	1.56*
2. Honolulu CC	35	64.72	790	1.14*
3. Kapiolani CC	120	61.11	874	1.06*
4. Windward CC	46	63.80	800	.78*

* N.S.

A final comparison was made between the introductory speech course students who participated in the original study and the broader sample of University of Hawaii-Manoa undergraduates who participated in this study. The comparison is shown in Table 3. No significant difference appeared.

Table 3.

Speech 151 and Manoa Undergraduates Compared

Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	d.f.	t
Speech 151	702	63.32	1456	1.5*
UH-Manoa Undergraduates	756	62.35		

* N.S.

The results confirm the earlier research. Apprehension about oral communication is high at the University of Hawaii, specifically among undergraduates on the principal campus at Manoa and the community college campuses. With 26.7 percent of the Manoa undergraduates and 29.7 percent of the community college students perceiving themselves to be almost always anxious about speaking, the University of Hawaii has a greater incidence of apprehension than found elsewhere in the nation. The national average is about 20 percent.

At the postgraduate level, not as many apprehensives appear, if this study's sampling of Law School students is representative of the total post graduate population. Perhaps four years of college helps reduce the anxiety or post graduate work attracts the less apprehensive. Further study of this group of students seems in order.

REFERENCES

1. R. E. Cambra and D. W. Klopf, "An Exploratory Study of Contest Speaker Characteristics," Speech Education, 6, 1978, 121-131.

2. R. Cambra, D. Klopf, and B. Oka, "Communication Apprehension Among University of Hawaii Students," Hawaii Council of Teachers of English convention paper, Honolulu, 1978.

3. J. A. Daly and S. Leth, "Communication Apprehension and the Personnel Selection Decision," International Communication Association convention paper, Portland, 1976.

4. J. A. Daly and J. C. McCroskey, "Occupational Choice and Desirability as a Function of Communication Apprehension," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 22, 309-313.

5. R. L. Falcione, J. C. McCroskey and J. Daly, "Job Satisfaction as a Function of Employees' Communication Apprehension, Self-Esteem, and Perceptions of Their Immediate Supervisors," Communication Yearbook I, B. D. Ruben, ed. (Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1977), 363-375.

6. H. Fensterheim and J. Baer, Don't Say Yes When You Want To Say No (New York: Dell Pub., Co., 1975), 20-21.

7. D. W. Klopf, "A Method of Reducing Apprehension in the Classroom," Speech Education, 6, 1978, 64-73.

8. D. W. Klopf, "Business and Professional Communication in Hawaii," Speech Education, 5, 1977.

9. D. W. Klopf, Increasing Assertion: A Method of Reducing Apprehension (San Jose, CA: Lansford Pub., Co., 1979).

10. J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, V. P. Richmond and B. G. Cox, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on Interpersonal Attraction," Human Communication Research, 2, 1975, 51-65.

11. J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, V. P. Richmond and R. L. Falcione, "Studies of the Relationship Between Communication Apprehension and Self Esteem," Human Communication Research, 3, 1977, 264-277.

12. J. C. McCroskey, "Measures of Communication-Bound Anxiety," Speech Monographs, 37, 1970, 269-277.

13. J. C. McCroskey, "Oral Communication Apprehension: A Summary of Recent Theory and Research," Human Communication Research, 4, 1977.

14. J. C. McCroskey, Quiet Children and the Classroom Teacher (Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 1977).

15. J. C. McCroskey and V. P. Richmond, "The Effects of Communication Apprehension on the Perception of Peers," Western Speech Communication, 40, 1976, 14-21.

16. J. C. McCroskey, "The Problem of Communication Apprehension in the Classroom," Communication, 4, 1976, 117-129.

17. B. J. Oka, R. E. Cambra and D. W. Klopf, "Reducing Apprehension about Communication," Psychological Reports, 44, 1979, 430.

18. G. Phillips and D. Butt, "Reticence Re-visited," Pennsylvania Speech Annual, 23, 1966, 40-57.

19. V. P. Richmond, "Communication Apprehension and Success in the Job Applicant Screening Process," International Communication Association convention paper, Berlin, 1977.

20. M. D. Scott, J. C. McCroskey and M. E. Sheahan, "Measuring Communication Apprehansion," Journal of Communication, 28, 1978, 104-111.

21. L. R. Wheeless, "Communication Apprehension in the Elementary School," Speech Teacher, 20, 1971, 297-299.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN APPREHENSION AROUT SPEAKING AND ABOUT WRITING

Ronald Cambra and Donald Klopf*

[A paper prepared for the 1979 Hawaii Council of the Teachers of English Convention, Honolulu, Hawaii.]

Phillips (17) wrote that "reticents preferred to communicate in writing where possible and most had achieved a fairly high level of skill at writing." His conclusion was derived from the diary reports of 198 college-age persons who were identified as severely inadequate oral communicators. Their reports and descriptions of feelings and attitudes about communication were compared by Phillips to similar data from 1100 students who appeared to have no problems.

McCroskey (15) argues, on the other hand, that the Phillips' conclusion represents the exception rather than the rule. He cites Miller and Daly research (16) to support his argument as he states that "correlations between the PRCA and the WAT have ranged between .30 and .40 for a wide variety of samples of both college students and other adults." Miller and Daly administered the PRCA-College and the WAT as well as other instruments to 349 teachers or spouses of teachers either enrolled in graduate extension programs or related to someone enrolled. They found the communication apprehension factor was significantly correlated with the writing apprehension measure [$r = .28$, $p < .05$).

Phillips and McCroskey appear to be in conflict over this matter of oral and written apprehension. So we wondered whose point of view was accurate, particularly as it pertained to University of Hawaii students, and we investigated the problem at the University. We hypothesized that students who were apprehensive about speaking also would be apprehensive about writing. The purpose here is to report the results of our investigation.

Communication Apprehension

Before doing so, we should explain what we mean by communication apprehension in its oral and written forms and examine the consequences for those who are anxious about speaking or writing.

Phillips (17), although primarily concerned with oral apprehension, provides a definition of communication apprehension which has relevance for written communication as well. He says the apprehensive communicator is the "person for whom anxiety about communication outweighs his projection of gain from the situation." That means the apprehensive communicator will either avoid communication situations or when required to communicate will react in an anxious manner. The person fears the negative consequences that

---

* Cambra is Assistant Professor and Klopf, Professor, Department of Speech, University of Hawaii.

might occur in such situations.

For those who are apprehensive about speaking, there are academic, social and work implications worth noting. Academically, the oral apprehensives tend to be less motivated to achieve (6), have lower overall college grade-point averages, earn lower grades in small classes, and obtain lower achievement scores on standardized tests (10). Socially, they generally engage in less self-disclosure (7), appear to be less attractive and less sexually alluring (13). In the work setting, they tend to select occupations that they perceive to require less talk (4), are not often promotable (3, 18), and seem to be less satisfied on the job (15).

For those who are apprehensive about writing, similar consequences occur in the classroom and at work. Daly and Miller (5) summarize these In school, the highly apprehensive will be the persons who fail to turn in written compositions, who fail to appear on days when writing is required, and who ordinarily do not voluntarily take courses that have much written work. Obviously they will not participate in extracurricular activities that stress writing, for instance, working on the school newspaper. Generally, they avoid occupations that require much writing, and, should they be given a writing assignment unexpectedly, they report being unhappy with the task. Because the classroom and many occupations, especially the higher paying administrative and managerial positions, require much writing, those who are highly apprehensive will be handicapped and, perhaps, not be as effective as they would desire to be. They avoid writing if they can and, when they cannot, will display high anxiety levels. Neither avoidance or anxiety displays will add to their competence as communicators.

Method

To test the hypothesis, 381 students enrolled in the introductory speech course at the University of Hawaii during the Spring 1979 semester completed the Written Apprehension Test (WAT, 5) and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension for College Students (PRCA-College, 14).

WAT consists of 26 statements concerning one's feelings about writing. The statements appear in a Likert-type format, each with five possible responses, from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The student selects the response for each statement which seems to represent his or her feelings. Thirteen statements are positively worded and the remainder negatively worded statements. Scores may range from a low of 26 to a high of 130. The mean score was 79.28 with a standard deviation of 18.86 for the subjects participating in the original development of the scale. Someone scoring above 98 is believed to be highly apprehensive about writing.

The nature of the statements is apparent in the following five examples selected from the scale: "I avoid writing," "I have no fear of my writing being evaluated," "I look forward to writing down my ideas," "Writing is a lot of fun," and "I'm nervous about writing."

The PRCA-College is a self-report measure of speaking apprehension. It consists of twenty items dealing with one's perceptions about talking to others in the dyadic, small group and public speaking situations. The responses are given on a Likert-type, five-point scale ranging from strongly

agree to strongly disagree. A person scoring 70 or higher, based on the norms for this measure, is considered highly apprehensive while someone scoring 60 or above is severely apprehensive. On the other hand, a person scoring below 60 is seen as a low apprehensive or not apprehensive at all (14). The measure correlates highly with similar instruments and its reliability and validity seem well established. Our use supports this (1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12).

Interested in finding out what relationship existed between the high and low apprehensives on both instruments, we compared the WAT scores for the high speaking apprehensive group with the WAT scores for the low speaking apprehensive group using Tuccy's T-test procedure.

Results

The mean score for the 381 students on WAT was 86.70 with a 16.85 standard deviation. When compared to the scores of the 164 students (M = 79.28, SD = 18.86) who constituted the population used in developing WAT, the difference was significant ($t = 4.35$, $p < .001$). Twenty-five percent of the Hawaii students scored above 98, the score reported as the one signifying apprehension (5). The results suggest that the Hawaii students perceive themselves to be more apprehensive about writing than the general American population.

The mean score for the Hawaii students on the PRCA-College was 63.42 with a 12.38 standard deviation. When compared to the sample of 2479 students (M = 60.45, SD = 11.58) who made up the population used in developing the PRCA-College, the difference was significant ($t = 4.40$, $p < .001$). Thirty-two percent scored 70 or higher, meaning that those students perceived themselves to be highly apprehensive about speaking. These findings confirm earlier research that the students in Hawaii tend to be more apprehensive about speaking than the general run of students in the United States.

The comparison of the WAT scores between the 128 Hawaiians with high PRCA-College scores (M = 83.99, SD = 16.25) and the 146 with low PRCA-College scores (M = 91.27, SD = 17.34) showed that the Hawaiians with low speaking apprehension scores have significantly higher writing apprehension scores ($t = 3.59$, $p < .001$) than those with high speaking apprehension scores. The data revealed that students with low PRCA-College scores had higher WAT scores and students with high PRCA-College scores had lower WAT scores.

Discussion

To recapitulate, Phillips (17) observed that reticent college students preferred to communicate in writing where possible. His observation was based on interviews with 198 reticent students. McCroskey (15) rejected that notion. He claimed that the Phillips sample represented the exception rather than the rule and that it is more likely that a person who is apprehensive about speaking will be apprehensive about writing. McCroskey's claim was based on a review of the Daly and Miller research on apprehension about writing.

This study examined McCroskey's claim as it might apply to University of Hawaii students. The hypothesis was that students who were apprehensive about

speaking also would be apprehensive about writing. The hypothesis was rejected. Data did not support the hypothesis that students who were apprehensive about speaking would be apprehensive about writing. Thus, McCroskey's claim was not upheld by the students in the University of Hawaii sample; the Phillips' observation was supported.

We have completed similar research (2) with Japanese college students and have reached the identical conclusion. Our populations in both the Japan and Hawaii studies were larger than that of Miller and Daly and were undergraduates in contrast to the Miller and Daly graduate-worker-teacher type subjects. Thus, our research casts doubt on McCroskey's claim that Phillips is incorrect in his prediction regarding an inverse relationship between apprehension of communication and writing.

However, in all cases, the samples are small and selective, suggesting that considerable additional study is in order. The Japanese investigation mentioned above undoubtedly presents problems other than those of sample size and quality that need to be reckoned with. In research such as that were a scale developed and tested in one culture is used to measure the behavior of people in another culture, there is the danger of encountering serious epistemological and methodological problems. Starr and Wilson (19) enumerate these and they need to be considered in evaluating our findings.

The results of this study and our other studies of oral apprehension in Hawaii point up two problem areas, ones important to teachers of English. The first is that the research shows that Hawaii has an oral apprehension problem. Graduates of local schools attending the University of Hawaii are afraid to speak in certain situations. When compared to college students elsewhere in the nation, local students perceive themselves to be significantly more apprehensive about speaking. Moreover, when the University of Hawaii's writing apprehension scores are compared to those from elsewhere in the country, the second problem appears. Local students again seem to be more apprehensive than their Mainland counterparts. Both problems are deserving of additional research. If the findings reported here are confirmed by such research, then these problems reflect on local instruction and changes are in order. An ability to communicate effectively is one every student has a right to expect and to attain upon graduation from high school.

REFERENCES

1 Cambra, R., Ishii, S. and Klopf, D., "Four Studies of Japanese Speech Characteristics," Communication, 7, 1978, 7-25.

2 Cambra, R., Ishii, S. and Klopf, D., "The Fear of Speaking and the Fear of Writing Among Japanese College Students," a paper prepared for the Japan Association of Current English Convention, October 1979.

3 Daly, J. and Leth, S., "Communication Apprehension and the Personnel Selection Decision," International Communication Association convention paper, Portland, 1976.

4 Daly, J. and McCroskey, J., "Occupational Choice and Desirability as

Function of Communication Apprehension," Journal of Counseling and Psychology, 22, 309-313.

[5] Daly, J. and Miller, M., "The Empirical Development of an Instrument to Measure Writing Apprehension," Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 1975, 242-249.

[6] Giffin, N. and Gilham, S., "Relationship Between Speech Anxiety and Motivation." Speech Monographs, 38, 1971, 70-73.

[7] Hamilton, P., "The Effect of Risk Proneness on Small Group Interaction, Communication Association and Self Disclosure," unpublished thesis, 1972.

[8] Ishii, S., Cambra, R. and Klopf, D., "Communication Anxiety: A Comparison of Japanese and American College Students," Otsuma Review, 10, 1978, 86-94.

[9] Ishii, S., Klopf, D. and Cambra, R., "Communication Apprehension Among Students in Japan, Korea and the United States." Presented at the 1978 Communication Association of the Pacific--Japan conference, Osaka.

[10] Klopf, D., "A Method of Reducing Apprehension in the Classroom," Speech Education, 6, 1978, 64-73.

[11] Klopf, D., Cambra, R. and Ishii, S., "Communication Apprehension Among Japanese Business and Professional People," Japanese Psychological Research, in press.

[12] Klopf, D., Ishii, S. and Cambra, R., "Patterns of Oral Communication Among the Japanese," Cross Currents, 5, 1978.

[13] McCroskey, J., Daly, J., Richmond, V. and Falcione, R., "Studies of the Relationship Between Communication Apprehension and Self Esteem," Human Communication Research, 3, 1977, 264-277.

[14] McCroskey, J., "Measures of Communication-Bound Anxiety," Speech Monographs, 37, 1970, 369-377.

[15] McCroskey, J., "Oral Communication Apprehension: A Summary of Recent Theory and Research," Human Communication Research, 4, 1977.

[16] Miller, M. and Daly, J., "The Development of a Measure of Writing Apprehension." Presented at the 1975 International Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

[17] Phillips, G., "Reticence: Pathology of the Normal Speaker," Speech Monographs, 35, 1968, 39-49.

[18] Richmond, V., "Communication Apprehension and Success in the Job Applicant Screening Process," International Communication Association convention paper, Berlin, 1977.

[19] Starr, B. and Wilson, S., "Some Epistemological and Methodological Issues in the Design of Cross-Cultural Research," Topics in Culture Learning 5, 1977.